12th May 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Local officials are given a certain amount of discretion and it is controlled by the Government."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—"Does the Hon. Minister know that the attendance in elementary schools has fallen very low in these famine areas?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"I suggest to the hon. Member to put a separate question."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"May I know whether the works that are being carried out are going to be given to contractors or will the Government themselves be taking responsibility for them?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I am afraid I have already answered that question."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM :—"May I know, Sir, who is to decide whether there is famine or not? Is it the Government or the local officer?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I am afraid I have already answered that question. Both the local officers and the Government."

SRI E. L. RAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—"Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether he will consider the desirability of executing these famine relief works departmentally?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I have already told the House that it is also being done."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Will the Government think of appointing some non-official committees, whose opinions also may be taken into account on this question?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I do not think the hon. Member wants to prolong the execution of the works; if that is his idea, I think the suggestion will be good but the Government want to hurry up with the work and bring immediate relief to the people."

Promulgation of orders under section 144 in Madras City.

* 2 *Q.*—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that orders under section 144 were promulgated in some parts of the City of Madras on the 6th of May 1952, and if so, why; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the police authorities have arrested nine persons and caused injuries to many due to a lathi charge?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"(*a*) It is a fact that orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, were

promulgated by the Commissioner of Police, Madras, prohibiting the taking out of processions, the shouting of slogans and the carrying of placards and flags in certain thoroughfares leading to the new Assembly Hall on 6th May 1952. As to the reason for the passing of the orders, the Commissioner of Police was satisfied that such demonstrations were likely to lead to disturbance of public tranquillity and peace. As immediate prevention of any such breach of the peace was necessary, the Commissioner of Police promulgated the orders on the afternoon of the 5th May.

" (*b*) It is a fact that the Police authorities effected some arrests. The number of persons so arrested was thirteen, not nine, and the arrests were for breach of the prohibitory order as well as disobedience of previous orders in force in the City as regards processions, etc., without licence.

" It is not true that the Police resorted to a lathi charge and therefore the latter half of this question does not arise."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know, Sir, from the Hon. the Chief Minister the grounds upon which the Government came to the conclusion that certain parties would lead a demonstration and that it would lead to violence and mischief and may I know whether any efforts were made by the Government to contact the leaders of the Communist Party and the United Democratic Front to ascertain whether it was a fact or not."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The matter has been fully discussed in another connexion and I have nothing more to add in answer to this supplementary question."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The Hon. the Chief Minister said that the matter has been fully discussed in another connexion but he did not say on the basis of what information, allegations were made and on what ground the names of these parties were included in the order? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The question has been answered with regard to the facts that were wanted. As regards the grounds upon which the Commissioner of Police acted, I have stated in answer to clause (*a*) of the question that he had certain information. As regards any further details, it is not possible nor is it convenient to answer by way of reply to a supplementary question."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Minister stated that it was not true that a lathi charge was made. May I in that connexion submit that 13 people were treated for injuries on account of the lathi charge by the Police and will the Government take that information from me and will they institute an enquiry into the matter? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is giving information."

12th May 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I am also suggesting the institution of an enquiry."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If the hon. Member has any complaint to make, he can certainly send the complaint to me and the Government will look into it."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" The Hon. Minister said in the course of his reply that a previous order had also been infringed namely, that a licence was not taken out for taking out a procession. May I know, Sir, for how long the order for taking out a licence for holding meetings or taking out processions in the City has been in force and for how many more years will it continue? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The orders that were referred to, regarding the necessity for taking out a licence before a procession is taken out or a meeting is held, have been in force since 1950, and they were repeated in accordance with the Code of Criminal Procedure from time to time and they will end by about June this year. As to whether they will continue or not, it will depend upon the state of things at that time."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" May I know, Sir, whether the orders under section 144 were promulgated by the Commissioner of Police *suo motu* or in consultation with the Hon. the Chief Minister? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If the question is with reference to the last order issued on the 5th June 1952 the proposal was made by the Commissioner and it was finalised in consultation with the Government."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" I wish to submit that my question has not been answered. The question was whether the leaders of the parties against whom such action was taken by the Commissioner of Police were sent for and consulted and their opinion ascertained before the Government gave their final sanction for promulgating orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, against them."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Information was brought on the 5th of May with reference to action to be taken on the 6th and at that time there was sufficient material for the Government to come to a conclusion in the matter. I did not consult the leaders, because the printed material relating to the matter was enough to show that there was sufficient ground for apprehension."

SRI K. VINAYAGAM :—" Is the Hon. the Chief Minister aware that in the course of giving effect to the orders under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, an hon. Member of this House was humiliated by a Police official and he was actually manhandled while he was entering the Assembly? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I do not think that anybody was humiliated."

[12th May 1952

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Was it not possible for the Commissioner of Police to consult the leaders of parties against whom the orders were passed *ex parte*? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This supplementary question is, in my humble opinion, mis-conceived. The question is not whether any particular parties were responsible or not responsible, but the real question was whether there was a danger of the demonstration itself and whether the apprehension was well-founded or not. Whether any party, A or B took part in it or made arrangements for it or another party did or did not attend a meeting in connexion with it, is not the question at issue, but the matter is with reference to the resulting apprehension for which there was ample ground, and the only point was that the demonstration should not be allowed to be held in the approaches to the Legislative Assembly. The fact that a particular party did or did not join in it, is a totally different issue and that was discussed the other day."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" May I know, Sir, why then were the names of parties brought in, in that order if the purpose of the Government was only to prevent the demonstration taking place? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There are two aspects of that question, one is whether certain disturbances were apprehended or not, and the other is the reasons for that apprehension, which may be partly correct or partly incorrect. The only question is whether there was sufficient justification for the apprehension. So far as the necessity for the promulgation of the orders was concerned, there was enough reason and the Commissioner was bound to state the grounds, broadly or in detail according to his discretion, and they were mentioned. As to whether any particular party mentioned did or did not do the particular thing alleged, is not really relevant for the question whether the order was necessary. It is only the entire totality of circumstances that is relevant for that purpose."

SRI S. T. ADITYAN :—" I wish to know, Sir, whether the printed material referred to by the Hon. the Chief Minister referred in terms to the particular political parties, namely, the United Democratic Front and the Communist Party functioning in this House and if so, whether he will be pleased to place the printed material on the table of the House? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The printed material that I referred to gave sufficient ground for apprehending a demonstration, but the accuracy of the editorial statements is not at all relevant for the questions. Whether the Editor of the Dhina Thanthi or the Viduthalai spoke the truth is not the point, but only the attitude taken up by the Dhina Thanthi (with which the hon. Member is connected in a way) and the Viduthalai. Whether the printed materials

12th May 1952]

were sufficient for the Government to apprehend on the evening of May 5, that there would be demonstrations on the morning and again in the evening of May 6, that is the only question. There was ample evidence and I will read it to the House if desired to show that no Commissioner of Police with his head on his shoulders and brains in his head could ignore the same." (Cheers.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" According to the answer given by the Chief Minister there was sufficient ground for him to apprehend that there would be a demonstration, and I would like to ask him whether an apprehension of the demonstration alone would warrant issue of orders under section 144 or the material before him should warrant the inference that there would be a breach of the peace?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I have answered the question enough; I am afraid it is a debate really that is being conducted. I think questions are intended for eliciting information and not for eliciting arguments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" We shall pass on to the next question." 11-30 a.m.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Sir, now that the Hon. the Chief Minister himself has told us that this has become a debate, it is evident that most of the Members want more information. I therefore request you, Sir, to kindly allow a half-hour debate on this."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have already allowed enough time for this question the other day and to-day. I am not therefore going to allow a half-hour debate."

Refusal by the Deccan Abkari and Sugar Factory to take sugarcane from the growers.

* 3 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations were made on behalf of the sugarcane growers of Karur and Kulittalai taluks of Tiruchirappalli district to the effect that the Deccan Abkari and Sugar Factory situated at Pugalur refuses to take the sugarcane from the growers; and

(b) whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGANA GOUD :—" (a) Yes.

" (b) Yes. The Government have already asked the Factory Management to complete crushing of all the registered cane before closing down. The management's final reply is awaited.